



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that expresses itself on certain occasions in dash and innuendo. It is far more disgusting than anything in Catullus himself.

On the whole, the book, though rather too disdainfully self-confident in manner, and inferior in real solidity of grounding to some other treatises of the series in which it is issued, will have to be taken seriously into consideration by future editors of Catullus.

E. T. M.

Q. Horati Flacci Carmina. Recensuit FRIDERICUS VOLLMER.
Editio Maior. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1907. Pp. viii + 390. M. 2.

Briefly in the preface of this book and at greater length in an article in *Philologus*, Supplementband X, pp. 261-322, "Die Überlieferungsgeschichte des Horaz," Professor Vollmer has stated the principles upon which he has based his edition. His theory is expounded in a clear and interesting way, and in innumerable details shows erudition and long and careful thought. The results of the whole investigation, however, are disappointing. Many important conclusions are based on hypotheses which are not adequately supported by the evidence, and while it is patent that the classification of the MSS given by Keller and Holder is open to serious criticism, it is doubtful whether Vollmer has proved himself a safer guide.

Instead of the threefold classification of Keller and Holder, Vollmer sets up a twofold classification. According to him all the MSS of Horace are derived from one or the other of two copies made in the eighth century from the text which Mavortius emended in the sixth century; Mavortius' text was derived from Porphyrio's edition, which in its turn went back to an edition by the grammarian Probus of the first century.

The weakness of this stemma is obvious. Vollmer has wholly failed to establish any connection between Porphyrio and Probus. Moreover, he has not proved that Probus made an edition of Horace. There are no traces of such an edition, nor does Probus' name even appear in the scholia of Horace. But the most surprising feature of the whole stemma is the assumption that all the MSS are derived from copies of the very MS which Mavortius emended and which, Vollmer thinks, survived till the eighth century. It is true that the period from the sixth to the eighth century showed a vastly diminished interest in the copying of MSS, but it is not safe to assume from the absence of direct testimony that Horace was wholly neglected and that his works were neither read nor copied.

The two copies of the MS of Mavortius from which all our codices are derived showed differences, according to our editor, along these lines: the order of the poems, the errors of the scribes, and finally the scholia and glosses. In determining whether a given MS belongs to his class

I or class II Vollmer has examined it from these three points of view. In class I he includes A B C E D; in II, Bland. R F λ l δ π. But on examination this apparently clean-cut classification shows complications. R, for example, agrees sometimes with class I and sometimes with class II. Not even Vollmer himself follows this classification to its logical conclusions, for while he does not concede any independent value to Bland., he adopts in *Serm.* 1. 6. 126 the reading *campum lusumque trigonem* for which it is the sole authority. The assertion of the editor's opinion that the apparent independence of Bland. is due solely to the accident that this part of the *Satires* is missing in A B and C, and that if they had contained the passage they would undoubtedly have shown the same reading, will convince no one.

Professor Vollmer does not claim finality for his work. He recognizes the complexity of the question, and one of his principal aims is to arouse interest in a subject which too many have regarded as practically settled. In this he will undoubtedly be successful, and on account of the stimulus given to the study of the whole problem, as well as for the soundness of judgment shown in the discussion of many individual passages, his edition is of importance.

G. J. LAING

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Aristotelis de Animalibus Historia. Textum recognovit LEONARDUS DITTMAYER. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1907. Pp. 467. M. 6.

Aristotle's *History of Animals*, for its time one of the most significant of his works, now possesses only the historic interest that attaches to the early stages in the science of descriptive anatomy and physiology.

Dittmeyer's work marks a distinct advance upon the last published edition of this treatise, the important one of Aubert and Wimmer in 1868, as well as upon the earlier standard edition of Bekker. He has made an independent and most careful collation of the manuscripts, with results notable in not a few doubtful passages.

The preface gives a clear and full statement of the value and relations of the manuscripts, as well as of the various translations and editions of the work. Dittmeyer agrees with previous scholars in regarding the tenth book as spurious. The seventh and ninth books, with the last ten chapters of the eighth, which had been called in question by Aubert and Wimmer, are also rejected, upon convincing grounds.

The text is a painstaking and, on the whole, a conservative one, though occasionally an ill-considered departure from the manuscript readings is found, as for instance the emendation of *ἄνθρωπος* to *γύνος*, A 1, 488 a 27, which seems to rest upon a misconception of the force of *ἀεί* which here